

Mislabeled orientation descriptions have been corrected in the section, Brief Description of the Drawings.

Text has been added to the Detailed Description of the Invention section, describing in words the disclosure presented by the drawings. The Applicant's representative notes that the substitute specification addresses any supposed deficiencies in the written description under 35 USC § 112.

The changes to the Detailed Description of the Invention section of the specification are supported by the originally filed drawings. Drawings may provide support for the written description requirement in conformance with MPEP 608.01(o) and MPEP 2163.

The practical, legitimate inquiry in each case of this kind is what the drawing in fact discloses to one skilled in the art. Whatever it does disclose may be added to the specification in words without violation of the statute and rule which prohibit "new matter," 35 U.S.C. 132, Rule 118, for the simple reason that what is originally disclosed cannot be "new matter" within the meaning of this law. If the drawing, then, contains the necessary disclosure, it can "form the basis of a valid claim."

*-In re Wolfensperger*, 302 F.2d 950, 133 USPQ 537 at 542 (C.C.P.A. 1962)

As noted in MPEP 2163(II)(A)(3)(a), the disclosure may be express, implicit, or inherent. "The fundamental factual inquiry is whether the specification conveys with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, applicant was in possession of the invention as now claimed." MPEP 2163 citing *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563-64, 19 USPQ2d at 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Obvious typographical errors and grammar have been corrected. For example, in the second paragraph following the header, Description of the Drawings, on page 2 of the specification, the term "boding" has been replaced with "bonding." It is suggested that the correction of this error would be obvious because the term "bonded" is used in the immediately following description of FIG. 2. It is suggested that this and similar changes are permitted as discussed in MPEP 2163.07.

The Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the application in an interview and for considering the claim amendments currently presented.

The Applicant has made every effort to put the application and its claims in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/dms/

Dana Stangel

USPTO Reg. No. 64870